General Authorization Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3)

A Petition for an Extension of Time and a check in payment of the extension of time fee accompany this Amendment and Response. In addition, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees deemed due under 37 CFR 1.17, including any extension of time fees not paid by the accompanying check, to Deposit Account 19-2260. Further, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to treat this or any future response requiring a petition for an extension of time, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

Further, if it is determined that any other fees are due in this application, or if it is determined that an overpayment has been made, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account 19-2260 as appropriate.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments presented above amend three claims, cancel 26 claims and add no new claims. Consequently, it is believed that no new claim fees have been generated by this filing. It is believed that an extension of time is required. A Petition for an extension of time and a check in payment of the extension fees accompany this Response. If it is determined that additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-2260 in the amount of such fees.

Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action reject claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the antecedent basis issue.

Sections 5 and 6 of the Office Action reject claims 21-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,286 of Gee et al. Claims 21-45 have been canceled via the amendments presented above.

Sections 7 and 8 of the Office Action reject claims 1-20 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,433,794 of Beadle et al. (Beadle) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,286 of Gee et al. (Gee). The claims have been amended to further clarify the multiple virtual machine environment to which the pending claims are directed. The builder tool of the pending claims facilitates the building of multiple applications into an executable image to run in a multiple virtual machine environment.

Attorney Docket 00H1451

Appl. No. 09/681,263 Amdt. Dated April 3, 2006

Reply to Office Action of Nov. 1, 2005

By way of contrast, Beadle only deals with choosing a single virtual machine for use with a browser. Beadle does not disclose a builder tool for an embedded multiple virtual machine environment. Beadle also does not disclose a builder tool for an environment of concurrently-running multiple virtual machines. Further, Beadle does not provide an interface capable of assembling various applications into a concurrentlyrunning multiple virtual machine environment. Thus, the combination of Gee with Beadle's interface for selecting a single virtual machine version for a single virtual machine environment, does not result in a system having an interface capable of building multiple applications into an executable image to run in an environment of multiple, concurrently-running, virtual machines. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable over the cited combination.

Applicants believe that the remarks and amendments presented herein fully address the rejections stated in the Office Action. It is further believed that the remarks establish that the pending claims are allowable over the stated rejections. Consequently, entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 3, 2006 Date

Michael F. Williams

Reg. No. 39,875

Attorney for Applicants (319) 366-7641 (ext. 222) PTO Customer No. 24234